Regional
Transportation
Investment
District

411 University St.
Suite 1200
Seattle, WA 98101
206 442-4254
www.rtid.org

Blueprint for Progress: Moving Forward Together

Proposal Presented to Sound Transit Board of Directors on January 26, 2006

Updated on July 18, 2006

Reducing traffic congestion by investing in roadways and bridges in King, Pierce and Snohomish counties

Regional
Transportation
Investment
District

Blueprint for Progress: Moving Forward Together

Proposal Presented to Sound Transit Board of Directors on January 26, 2006

Updated on July 18, 2006

I. Introduction

On January 26, 2006, the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID) presented the *Blueprint for Progress: Moving Forward Together* to the Sound Transit Board of Directors. This *Blueprint* is a proposal for investments for highways, roads, and bridges in key corridors in Pierce, King, and Snohomish Counties. The *Blueprint* explains the guiding assumptions underlying the proposal, includes possibilities for new boundaries and the use of transit for congestion mitigation, and describes funding sources and revenue projections that were available in January 2006. This document also includes changes necessary to implement the proposed transportation package that were submitted during the 2006 legislative session in anticipation of a 2006 vote.

During the 2006 session, the Legislature enacted ESHB 2871.[1] This bill provided for many of the changes to the RTID statutory authority outlined below. At the same time, ESHB 2871 allows RTID and Sound Transit to pursue a vote no sooner than 2007; the legislation also requires that both ballot measures must either pass, or both will fail. Finally, the legislation requires RTID to "develop and include in the regional transportation investment plan a funding proposal for the state route number 520 bridge replacement and HOV project that assures full project funding for seismic safety and corridor connectivity on state route number 520 between Interstate 5 and Interstate 405." Given these changes, RTID staff are currently evaluating how to proceed. However, the original *Blueprint* remains the template from which we are starting and is provided below for reference.

[1] *See* http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?year=2006&bill=2871 for more information about ESHB 2871.

II. Key Elements of *Blueprint for Progress*

Key elements of this proposal include the following:

- Targeting investments by corridor to integrate roads and transit investments;
- Keeping the investments affordable: this proposal would cost each household from approximately $8-10 per month, or from $100-120 per year, and retain 100% of the money raised in our three county area;
- Modifying the RTID and Sound Transit boundaries to be the same boundaries;
- Reducing RTID's reliance on the sales tax and placing primary reliance on the Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET) to provide a funding package;
- Planning for transit to assist in traffic flow as an eligible investment for RTID funding to provide construction traffic impact mitigation.

III. Guiding Principles

These principles represent the core thinking about the roads component of a regional roads and transit package. They are combined from RTID statutory requirements, the Chair's Proposal (April 2006), and the original *Blueprint* (January 2006). This list in this form was presented to the RTID Executive Board on May 31, 2006 for its consideration.

1. Build Off Existing State Investments in Key Areas:

a. Areas where value of existing state investments can be significantly increased by completing additional improvements in that corridor, and

b. Important time sensitive corridor improvements that were not funded or not adequately funded by state funding investments.

2. Prioritize Regional Investments into Critical Corridors and Key Investments:

a. The region's needs exceed our ability to fund all projects at the same time.

b. Focus on corridors and investments within those corridors to reduce congestion and improve safety, improve travel time, increase daily and peak person and vehicle trip capacity, reduce person and trip delay, and improve air quality.

c. Improve freight mobility.

d. Projects must be in the Puget Sound Regional Council's *Destination 2030* Plan.

e. Maintain flexibility to adapt over time by leaving some funding unallocated.

3. Create an Integrated Regional Transportation Plan that Includes Both Roads and Transit Together:

a. Build off successful examples of combined road and transit packages from San Diego, Denver, and Vancouver, B.C.

b. Review project phasing, staging to maximize reliability, certainty of region's transportation system while minimizing disruption during construction.

c. Demonstrate to our voters that we have a unified regional transportation plan that makes sense and is affordable.

4. Keep Road and Transit Package Affordable:

a. Ensure that investments are cost effective

b. Limit revenue sources

c. Integrate roads/transit package

d. Minimize bonding

e. Focus on cash flow over twenty year period

IV. Proposed Investment Strategy and Plan

A. Introduction

The proposal assumes targeted investments in major regional corridors. Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) staff, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and local government transportation planners provided traffic flow and origin and destination data that were used to help identify investments with the greatest congestion relief benefit. WSDOT staff helped analyze the previous Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID) project list to factor in the new project funding from the 2005 legislative package, the Transportation Partnership Act (TPA). The TPA investments helped drive where regional dollars would be the next logical investment. Some projects were also removed from consideration because the TPA fully funded the project. For example, TPA and previous state gas tax funds will complete the northern segment of the Pierce County HOV lanes originally included in the RTID project list.

Other factors considered include construction impacts from the TPA and nickel projects, early Sound Transit Phase 2 planning, and other transit plans. Project costs are based on the most recent cost review information made available to RTID and will need to be updated. These cost numbers were initially developed through the cost review process in 2004. Not all projects in this proposal have been aged according to a construction-sequencing plan. In addition, project costs do not reflect any cost updates completed by WSDOT in late December 2005.

Further project cost updates, scope verifications, and a financing plan would need to be developed with the WSDOT during the public process and before a public vote. In addition, the RTID statute requires that all projects undergo an independent cost review. The 2004 cost review would need to be updated using the same independent review process.

B. District Boundary Modifications

Combining the RTID and Sound Transit boundaries is a key element for success of a combined transit and road proposal. In both King and Pierce Counties, the Sound Transit boundaries largely encompass the needed transportation improvements. For King and Pierce Counties, the proposal would be to utilize the existing Sound Transit boundary.

Snohomish County presents a different challenge because the existing Sound Transit boundary only covers the southwest urban growth areas (as far north as Everett) and leaves out much of the north and east portions of the county. Many of the road projects in Snohomish County are located outside of the present Sound Transit boundary. Three major Highways of Statewide Significance (State Routes 9 and 522, and US 2) would fall outside the boundary. Several projects in the north would also be outside of the existing Sound Transit boundary. In addition, current local transit services are outside the current Sound Transit boundary. The proposal to resolve these issues is to expand the Sound Transit boundary and contract the RTID boundary into one composite boundary for the joint package.

The following guidelines were used in developing the new boundary proposal:

1. Include projects within the I-5 Snohomish Corridor Action Plan (SNOCAP). This includes both the I-5 and SR 9 corridors from the King County line to Arlington.

2. Include the adjoining Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) along the SNOCAP corridor, i.e. I-5 and SR 9.
3. Consider existing transit service areas or major routes within Snohomish County for inclusion in the new composite boundary.
4. Explore inclusion of the Tulalip Reservation within the new boundary due to recent and continuing economic development.
5. Explore eligibility concepts for including HSS routes that fall outside the boundary such as SR 2 and SR 522.

Applying these guidelines results in a Sound Transit/RTID service area bounded by King County to the south, Puget Sound to the west, SR 9 (and associated UGAs) to the east, and Arlington to the north. It would allow a system approach to include not only roads and local transit projects, but also Sound Transit Phase 2 projects. This would allow development of one multi-modal system within one boundary serving the primary growth areas described in Snohomish County's recently completed 20 year comprehensive plan. The dual backbone of the transportation network within this new boundary consists of I-5 and SR 9, the two major north-south and heavily used transportation corridors. This boundary is an initial proposal and may require refinements based on further analysis.

C. Transit Operations to Mitigate Construction Traffic Impacts

This proposal recommends providing for transit operating costs to local transit agencies as a means of providing traffic mitigation during construction of the mega projects. Funds might be used for bus, vanpool, and/or transportation demand management, including service hours. Mitigation plans would be developed as construction planning is undertaken. This will require a change in the existing RTID statute.

In addition, the proposal for a joint Sound Transit and RTID ballot will allow the voters to see the integration of road and transit investments throughout the region.

D. Targeted Investments in Pierce County

1. Transportation Needs

The economic well-being of Pierce County is inextricably linked with its highways. Almost 30% of Pierce County's residents commute to jobs in King County. By 2020, Pierce County's population will increase by more than an additional 200,000 people. The proposed RTID investments seek to link Pierce County's "jobs highways" so workers and products have freedom of movement throughout the region.

2. Corridor Investments

State Route 167: The key project in Pierce County would provide a new north-south corridor as an alternative route to I-5 by connecting SR 167 between SR 509 in the City of Tacoma and the existing SR 167 at Puyallup. This connection would allow commuters direct access from the City of Tacoma to SR 167 as an alternative route to I-5 and would improve freight mobility and access to the 4th largest warehouse, distribution and manufacturing center in the United States— the Valley Cities area, which includes the Pierce County cities of Fife, Puyallup, Sumner, Algona, Pacific and Auburn and the King County portion of Auburn, Kent, Renton and Tukwila— from the Port of Tacoma. This project would help accommodate expansion at the Port and drive economic development. The project configuration is currently being refined by WSDOT and local governments. The proposed investment would allow purchase of the right of way, critical to the long-term viability of this corridor, and make an investment in this corridor that could be augmented over time.

State Route 162: This project would help provide congestion relief for the more than 400,000 people who live in Eastern Pierce County by adding capacity to SR 162 in the vicinity of Sumner and Orting. Significant improvements would be made to critical interchanges.

State Route 704 (Cross Base Highway): Construction of the new State Route 704 would provide a critical east-west corridor link from I-5 to south central Pierce County. This will help reduce congestion on SR 512 by improving linkage to I-5 through McChord Air Force Base and Fort Lewis properties. This project would provide economic benefits to the region by improving access from I-5 to manufacturing facilities in Frederickson, the largest manufacturing and industrial site with land available in the region.

Additional Investments and Contingency: Funding is included for additional targeted investments and a contingency fund if needed. An example of an additional investment would be the direct access off-ramp from I-5 to 38th Street.

3. Summary Table of Investments in Pierce County

Project Name*	**RTID Funding Share (millions)**
SR 167	1,000
SR 162	180
Cross Base Highway (SR 704)	210
Additional Investments and Contingency	104
Total	**1,494**

* Project scope to be finalized by WSDOT.

E. Targeted Investments in King County

1. Transportation Needs

King County's population is the 12th largest county population in the United States, and is expected to grow by more than 1/3 by 2010. Population growth is occurring more rapidly in the suburban areas than the urban areas and leading to heavily congested roads. At the same time, King County and the region's economy depends on a number of large and expanding employment centers as well as the Port of Seattle and the 4th largest warehousing, distribution and manufacturing district in the United States (the Valley Cities area, which includes the Pierce County cities of Fife, Puyallup, Sumner, Algona, Pacific and Auburn and the King County portion of Auburn, Kent, Renton and Tukwila). Severe congestion problems hamper both commuters and freight mobility. In addition, some of our most critical infrastructure is unsafe and needs to be repaired. Proposed investments in King County are targeted at six main corridors: I-5, I-405, SR 167, SR 520, SR 509, and SR 99 and the Alaska Way Viaduct. These investments will help improve traffic flow throughout the region and address critical safety concerns.

2. Corridor Investments

SR 167: State Route 167 serves one of the fastest growing areas of King County, but suffers from more than six hours of congestion a day. Improvements in this corridor would provide commuters better access to affordable housing and employment centers and will expand freight mobility to the Valley Cities warehousing district. The scope of this project includes HOV improvements within the King County section of SR 167 and targeted general-purpose improvements at chokepoints. This investment builds upon funding designated by the Legislature in the 2005 session.

I-5/ SR 509: Improvements of I-5 and SR 509 would provide a direct southern access point to SeaTac Airport, increase freight mobility out of the Port of Seattle directly to the Kent Valley, and improve a critical chokepoint on I-5 by adding general purpose lanes to I-5 and decreasing truck traffic on our most important north-south corridor (I-5) between the port/industrial area and destinations south of the airport.

This project is ready to proceed to construction. Right of way costs are escalating due to development pressures. This project would create an alternative for people driving I-5 to and from Seattle from the south. Truck freight would use this corridor as an alternative to I-5. This proposal would build a new six-lane freeway between I-5 and S. 188th Street in SeaTac. This project would include HOV lanes and provide a key transit connection to the SeaTac International Airport from the south. This project would also construct six miles of improvements on I-5 from S. 320th in Federal Way to S. 200th. New I-5 lanes would be configured to provide one new lane north bound and two new lanes south bound. This project would also connect the airport's south access expressway to SR 509 and I-5.

I-405: The I-405 corridor has realized a 200% increase in traffic congestion over the last 10 years. It leads the region in daily hours of congestion, with more than 50% of the day in gridlock. The cost of delays, livability and air quality degradation are clear impacts. Recent state packages funded key projects designed to relieve the corridor's worst bottlenecks, but additional funding is needed complete the missing links.

The southern section of I-405 from I-90 to I-5 is the worst congested roadway in the State of Washington. Approximately 18,000 cars per day stay on I-5 and contribute to congestion on

the I-90 and 520 bridges rather than face lengthy delays on south I-405. This corridor's currently incomplete configuration contributes significantly to the congestion in this critical alternative to I-5. In 2020, approximately 380,900 people are expected to travel through this segment of the corridor in 274,800 vehicles. Clearly, existing capacity constraints will grow more acute over time. This project would help fill these gaps and provide a consistent number of lanes in these critical sections.

This investment of $1.3 billion in I-405 would provide additional lanes in each direction from SR 169 (Maple Valley Highway) to I-90. This improvement would reduce 2020 congestion between Renton and I-90 by more than four hours per day while serving much higher traffic volumes. In addition, targeted improvements would be made in Bellevue between SR 520 and I-90 and elsewhere to complement the TPA and Nickel investments underway by the state.

SR 520: This proposal would provide $800 million in regional funds toward replacing the seismic and storm-vulnerable existing Evergreen Point Floating Bridge from the east shore of Lake Washington to the Montlake touchdown. This strategy would preserve a critical link in our transportation system. Regional funding would be combined with tolls and state funds to provide a new structure. This funding is an insurance policy to ensure that the bridge span's critical infrastructure can be replaced or augmented up to 6-lanes.

SR 99 and the Alaskan Way Viaduct: This proposal would provide assurance that the preferred tunnel option to replace the existing viaduct structure would be funded. This proposal recognizes funding from the City of Seattle, Port of Seattle and federal government together with the state and regional funding. Based on the project description developed in April 2004, this project would construct a new six lane facility. The cost estimate is based on replacing the existing viaduct and Seattle's central waterfront seawall with a new six lane tunnel, with a connection to an improved Battery Street Tunnel. Corridor performance would be enhanced with the additional shoulder and safety improvements made.

I-5 and Federal Way Triangle: The proposed RTID funds would complete this interchange, currently rated as the fifth most congested freeway chokepoint in the state and the site of numerous accidents. Freight traffic to and from the Port of Tacoma uses this access to SR 18 and SR 161.

Additional Investments and Contingency: This is included to allow for revenue-forecast adjustments and other regional needs. Other regional needs under discussion include SR 518, the South Park Bridge, Mercer Street, the Spokane Street Viaduct, and other regional arterials.

3. Summary Table of Investments in King County

Project Name	**Proposed RTID Investments (in millions)***
SR 99: Alaska Way Viaduct	800
I-405	1,330
SR 520 Bridge	800
I-5 Improvements and SR 509 Extension	870
SR 167	420
I-5 Improvements at SR 18 (Federal Way Triangle)	50
Additional Investments and Contingency	237
Total	**4,507**

* Project Scope to be finalized by WSDOT.

F. Targeted Investments in Snohomish County

1. Transportation Needs

Snohomish County is in the midst of addressing a high rate of growth and congestion problems, especially as area residents commute across the County to and from work:

- Between 1990 and 2000, Snohomish County's population grew by 30.1%--the fastest among the four central Puget Sound counties.
- Approximately 40% of Snohomish County's 300,000 workers commute outside of the county every day, with most traveling to King County (34.4%). Approximately 20% of workers in Snohomish County commute from other counties.
- The Snohomish County economy is forecasted to grow 20% between 1998 and 2010, adding 44,755 new jobs. Current projections show that most growth is expected to occur in the southwest portion of the county (Everett, Lynnwood, and Bothell.) All three are designated "Regional Centers" by the Puget Sound Regional Council.

Transportation is a key issue for Snohomish County employers. Snohomish County has an "unusually high share" of its total employment in the manufacturing industry, with employment levels in 2001 at 25% as compared to 7% in King only and 6% nationwide. This county is within one of the top ten biotechnology regions in the nation. Commuting alternatives are critical to ensure that the local workforce can reliably get to work on time.

2. Proposed Investments

Snohomish County's proposed investments would fund a diverse mix of projects that enhance current transportation investments. Over the past four years, the Snohomish County agencies have worked cooperatively to develop this prioritized list that addresses congestion along key state highway corridors, critical city and county arterial streets, and improvements to multimodal transportation including park & ride lots and ferry terminals. As the RTID has been evolving, the project list is being modified to reflect changed scopes and costs, completed projects, and choices to reflect anticipated lower revenues. The proposed investments would continue to build on the current investments by focusing over significant funding along key state highway corridors of SR 9 and US 2. In addition, $100 million would complete five arterial street projects in Everett, Marysville, Edmonds, Lynnwood, Bothell, and Snohomish County. Approximately $170 million is earmarked to support transit-related projects, including continued investment in the Edmonds Multimodal Terminal. The specific Snohomish County investments include the projects contained in the table below.

3. Proposed Investments in Snohomish County

Project Name	Project Description	Funding Proposal (millions)
Improvements to Key North/South Routes, Interchanges and Access Roads to I-5 and SR 9		
I-5 and US 2 Trestle	Helps alleviate traffic chokepoint on I-5 by modifying I-5/ US 2 intersections and widening US 2. Addresses major safety concerns and improves water quality.	412.3
Everett Arterial Access Improvements at I-5/US 2	Improvements to Everett Arterial Access at I-5/US 2 to increase mobility in downtown Everett for general use and transit access. Reduces congestion and improves safety from users accessing I-5 and US 2.	28.9
116 St. NE: I-5 to State St.	Adds capacity and improves safety along east-west corridor with access to growing industrial and commercial areas; improves local/regional transit accessibility.	2.1
44th Ave. W: I-5 to 194th St. SW	Project constructs a new northbound lane on 44th Ave. W from 200th St. SW to 196th St. SW to add capacity to accommodate both the existing heavy northbound flow of traffic exiting I-5 at 44th Ave. W and the traffic that would be generated from Lynnwood city center development.	0.5
SR 9	Improves alternative route to I-5 by widening SR 9 from 176th St. SE to SR 92 from two lanes to four/five lanes with access control. Includes improvements to various intersections.	325.0
Improvements to Key East/West Corridors		
20th St. SE: US 2 and SR 9 Connection	Widens 20th St. SE between US 2 to SR 9 to improve commuter access, reduce bottleneck conditions at 20th and SR 9, help resolve development concurrency issues that limit economic development, increases safety for school buses and transit by improving corridor.	34.9
SR 524: 24th Ave. W to SR 527	Significantly expands vital east-west link between Lynnwood and Bothell, improves freight mobility to and from the Bothell/ Canyon Park technology corridor along SR 524; enhances multi-modal access for transit, bicycle, pedestrian.	71.8
112th St. SW: I-5 to SR 527	Widening of 112th St. SW to better connect I-5 and SR 527 to reduce congestion to Everett's Paine Field; promote freight mobility along three major north-south corridors (SR 525, SR 99, Airport Road); augments local trail system; upgrades local water quality detention features and restores streamflows.	3.0
SR 531: 43 Ave. NE to 67 Ave. NE	Decreases chokepoint between SR 9 and I-5 south of Arlington.	41.4
238th St SW from 84th Ave. W to SR 104	Improves connection between SR 104 and SR 99; adds capacity and reduces safety concerns.	2.2
196 St. SW (SR 524) from 48 Ave. W to 37 Ave. W	Widens road to increase access to I-5 and decrease traffic chokepoint in Lynnwood.	11.8
	HSS & HSS Approaches Total	**933.9**
Local Projects (Non-Highways of Statewide Significance)		
41st St. I-5 Overcrossing/ Lowell River Rd BNSF RR Overcrossing	Provides the second of a two-phase project to eliminate the at-grade BNSF mainline railway crossings at 36th St. and Lowell River Road along Everett's Snohomish Riverfront area. The project will enhance the safety and operational efficiency of one of the few east-west arterial routes across the Snohomish Valley.	7.6
84th Ave. W: 212 St. SW to 238 St. SW	Improves safety for pedestrians, school children, park users, bicyclists, and auto users.	8.7

Airport Way: SR 9 to Br #1	Widens roadway to improve capacity on county arterial and access to City of Snohomish area.	8.7
East Everett Overcrossing	Constructs a grade separation overcrossing to extend Everett Ave. over the BNSF Canadian Line to facilitate freight movement and traffic.	10.0
39/35 Ave SE: 240 St. SE to Seattle Hill Rd	Constructs new county and city arterial missing link and widens existing county arterial road to reduce congestion, provide alternative route to SR 527 and SR 9 from Bothell north towards Mill Creek, and increase safety by adding sidewalks and bike lanes.	57.1
State Ave.: 136 St. NE to 152 ST NE	Improves key north/south arterial parallel to I-5 near Marysville to meet necessary levels of service, decrease burden on I-5, and increase freight throughput.	3.6
36/35 Ave. W: Maple Rd. to 148 St. SW	Widens county arterial and city street to reduce congestion, provide safe pedestrian and bicycle movement and improve access into Lynnwood	11.0
	Non HSS Total	**106.7**
HOV and Transit		
I-5 Mountlake Terrace Commuter Parking Lot Expansion	Build enhanced transit hub for I-5 interchange; relieves overcrowded park and rides in Snohomish County; expands transit access and safety.	2.0
SR 525 Mukilteo Park & Ride Lot	Construct a park and ride facility along SR525 in the Harbour Pointe vicinity to meet transit parking demand for Community Transit commuter services. Facility will increase transit mode share and reduce congestion on SR525 and I-5 between Mukilteo and Seattle.	6.7
Edmonds (SR 104) Multimodal Terminal	Integrates ferry, commuter and intercity rail, bus transit, carpool/automobile/ pedestrian/bicycle traffic into single complex. Relocates existing state ferry terminal and realigns SR 104 to create grade separation, increase safety, and decrease vehicle queuing along SR 104.	123.4
Bus/Van Fleet Expansion	Procure buses and commuter vans to increase the levels of transit and vanpool service in the I-5 and I-405 corridors between Snohomish and King counties.	14.3
North County (I-5, SR 2, SR 9) Park & Ride Facilities	Program to design and construct 800 new park and ride stalls along state and interstate routes to address 2015 transit parking demand in North Snohomish County.	21.4
	HOV & Transit Total	**167.8**
	Proposed RTID Investment	**1,208.4***

Summary of Proposed Investments in Snohomish County

Project Type	**RTID Funding Share in millions***
Highways of Statewide Significances & Approaches	933.9
Non HSS projects	106.7
HOV and Transit	167.8
Total	**1208.4***

* The amount of revenue generated in Snohomish County under this proposal would exceed $1 billion, but additional work is needed to develop a good estimate of how much additional revenue there would be. The total revenue from within new district boundary lines could be sufficient to support this level of investment. In the event that the revenue generated is less, this project list would be modified.

V. Revenue Forecasts and Project Funding

The revenue tables generated by WSDOT, dated October 21, 2005, are the basis for the revenue forecast used in this proposal. These tables are based on the March 2004 forecasts by Conway Pedersen Economics, Inc. The revenue levels assume no bonding. The revenue is discounted by an "RTA factor" developed by King County's Department of Transportation. The discount is made to approximate the revenue to be generated within the RTA boundaries in the three county area.

To complete the proposed projects, bonding may be necessary. WSDOT assistance will be needed to develop a financial plan that includes the construction sequencing and aging of projects, including the construction and financing for matching TPA projects.

The RTA boundary in Pierce and King County is assumed to remain unchanged. In Snohomish County, it is proposed to increase the RTA boundary to reflect the new growth management boundary for the county. For purposes of this initial proposed plan, the Snohomish County revenue is listed at the minimum amount of funding that would be generated based on the existing RTA boundary; the revenue listed below does not reflect the revenue that could be produced from within an expanded boundary.

It must also be noted that MVET forecasts would be changed depending on legislation under consideration this session to modify the MVET valuation procedure. The valuation procedure under consideration would result in a revenue decline of approximately 27% from the current schedule. For that reason, the maximum MVET rate may be up to 0.8% to generate the projected revenue assumed here.

A. Revenue Sources and Yields

(See WSDOT October 21, 2005 Revenue Level Alternatives based on the March 2004 Revenue Forecast*)
*2007-2026 millions of nominal dollars***

Tax Source	**Three-County**	**King**	**Pierce**	**Snohomish**
0.1% Sales Tax	2,279	1,530	439	310
0.6 –0.8% MVET***	4,787	2,977	1,055	755
Total Revenue with Sound Transit Boundary	**7,066**	**4,507**	**1,494**	**1,065****

*The revenue assumptions available to RTID date from March 2004. Recent revenue forecasts from 2005 show a variance of plus or minus 3%. A new revenue forecast is needed before finalizing a package.

**The revenue is assumed to be generated beginning in 2007 and would be collected through 2026 (20 year period).

***MVET range depending on valuation method used.

****This level of funding reflects a minimum level that would be generated with the current RTA boundary. The amount of revenue generated for Snohomish County would be in excess of $1 billion, but additional work is needed to develop a good estimate of how much revenue could be generated from within a new boundary.

B. Household Costs

The revenue proposal is estimated to have the following household costs:

County	Median Household Income (2004)*	0.6% MVET	0.1% Sales Tax**	Total Household Cost by County***
Pierce	52,630-53,937	$86.00	$21.00	$107
King	58,938-59,718	$86.00	$21.00	$107
Snohomish	58,389-59,022	$86.00	$21.00	$107

*Median Household Income Estimates by County: 1989 to 2004 and Projection for 2005, from Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM), October 2005. This table contains estimates of median household income by county in current dollars; series revised 1990 forward. The estimation relies on both 1990 and 2000 census data. These estimates are based on past relationships between available indicator data and median household income. The estimates shown may differ from other median household income data developed from the Office of Financial Management's State Population Survey, Bureau of the Census surveys, or other sources. Survey data, which are subject to sampling variability and bias, are not necessarily more correct than the estimate data. For small counties, the estimated series may show large variations during certain periods.

Note: Household income figures differ among federal and state agencies that collect these data. The U.S. Census, Housing and Urban Development, and OFM each differ in their estimate of median income. This analysis is based on OFM figures since RTID is authorized by the State of Washington.

**This figure would be lower if the federal tax deduction for state sales tax (authorized through 2005) is extended.

*** Other methodologies produce an estimated cost from between $100 and $120/year.

C. Summary of Proposed Investments by County

County	Project Type	Funding Share in millions*
Pierce	SR 167	1,000
	SR 162	180
	SR 704 (Cross Base Highway)	210
	Additional Investments and Contingency	104
	Proposed Investment in Pierce County	**1,494**
King	SR 99: Alaska Way Viaduct	800
	I-405	1,330
	SR 520 Bridge	800
	I-5 Improvements and SR 509 Extension	870
	SR 167	420
	I-5 Improvements at SR 18 (Federal Way Triangle)	50
	Additional Investments and Contingency	237
	Proposed Investment in King County	**4,507**
Snohomish	Highways of Statewide Significances & Approaches	933.9
	Non HSS projects	106.7
	HOV and Transit	167.8
	Proposed Investment in Snohomish County	**1208.4***
	Total Proposed Investment	**7,209.4**

* The amount of revenue generated in Snohomish County under this proposal would exceed the $1.065 billion listed above, but additional work is needed to develop a good estimate of how much additional revenue would be generated from within a new boundary line. The total revenue from within new district boundary lines could be sufficient to support this level of investment. In the event that the revenue generated is less, this project list would be modified.

VI. RTID Legislative Proposal

To achieve the proposal outlined in the *Blueprint for Progress*, the following legislative changes were submitted during the 2006 Legislative Session. Some, but not all, were adopted by ESHB 2871.

1. Allow RTID to change its boundaries to be consistent with Sound Transit, and allow Sound Transit to expand or modify its boundaries in conjunction with the vote.

2. Simplify joint ballot procedures and provide for the option of a single combined ballot.

3. Allow system-wide tolling, including the SR 520 Bridge, and clarify tolling provisions.

4. Allow RTID to fund transit operations for construction mitigation.

5. Allow ballot title to be longer than currently limited by state law or create ballot title template.

6. Eliminate current restrictions on use of MVET funding.

7. Increase maximum MVET authority. The maximum limit should be up to 0.6% under current valuation methods, or up to 0.8% if new valuation methods are adopted by the legislature.

8. Modify bonding authority to allow state backed bonds for state projects.

9. Reduce local match requirement.

10. Do not prohibit a 2006 election.

In addition, the proposal is to allow corridor and project investments to go to the voters and then address long-term governance questions.